



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/731,899 | 12/09/2003 | Brian Jones | 60001.0182US11/MS303914.1 | 4706 |
| 27488 7590 06/15/2007 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903 | | | EXAMINER CHEN, QING | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2191 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 06/15/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,899

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Qing Chen

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :20060818, 20060828, 20061002, 20061023, 20061120, 20061226, 20070205, 20070209, 20070215, 20070309, 20070430.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed on April 19, 2007.
2. **Claims 1-18** are pending.
3. **Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, and 12-18** have been amended.
4. The objections to the oath/declaration are withdrawn in view of Applicant's submission of a supplemental oath/declaration.
5. The objections to the drawings are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the drawings and the specification.
6. The objections to the specification are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the specification. However, Applicant's amendments to the specification fail to fully address the objection due to a typographical error. Accordingly, this objection is maintained and further explained below.
7. The objections to Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12-18 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the claims.

Response to Amendment

Oath/Declaration

8. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

- Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

- It does not identify the mailing address of the third inventor. A mailing address is an address at which an inventor customarily receives his or her mail and may be either a home or business address. The mailing address should include the ZIP Code designation. The mailing address may be provided in an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76.

Specification

9. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: “an” should read -- and -- on page 25, line 21.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

10. **Claims 6-8, 10, 11, and 15-18** are objected to because of the following informalities:

- **Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 17, and 18** recite the limitation “the document.” Applicant is advised to change this limitation to read “the computer-generated document” for the purpose of providing it with proper explicit antecedent basis.
- **Claim 8** depends on Claim 7 and, therefore, suffers the same deficiency as Claim 7.
- **Claim 15** recites the limitation “determining whether the document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components.” However, this limitation is already recited in the independent claim, Claim 12. In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner subsequently does not give any patentable weight to this limitation for the purpose of further examination.
- **Claim 16** depends on Claim 15 and, therefore, suffers the same deficiency as Claim 15.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. **Claims 15 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 recites the limitation “the step of downloading the software components to the application.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner subsequently interprets this limitation as reading “downloading the software components to the application” for the purpose of further examination.

Claim 16 depends on Claim 15 and, therefore, suffers the same deficiency as Claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 1-6, 9, and 12-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Donohue et al.** (US 5,987,480) in view of **Baldwin et al.** (US 5,877,757).

As per **Claim 1**, Donohue et al. disclose:

- attaching a schema to a document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document (*see Column 8: 25-54, "HTML documents ... contains text 30 and standard HTML tags 32 including character and paragraph formatting tags ..., tags to produce a form to be completed by a user ..., anchors for hyperlinks ..., and image insertion tags ... "*);
- structuring the document to associate the document with the schema (*see Column 10: 10-17, "... designing HTML documents in the normal manner, i.e., by inserting text and HTML tags ... "*);
- associating a document solution with the document structure (*see Column 10: 34-42, "The script 14 also selects a template based at least in part on the document requested in the URL ... "*);

Art Unit: 2191

- determining whether the document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components (*see Column 10: 17-19, "The templates may be assigned filenames with extensions .tem, and are saved and stored in various directories on the web server ..."; Column 12: 58-60, "The newly constructed physical path is then used to determine whether a template file exists for the browser ..."*);
- if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, assembling a plurality of software components comprising one or more document solutions at a location remote from the document (*see Column 10: 49-51, "The contents of the selected template are then retrieved, step 56, either all at once or by loading sections of the template sequentially into a buffer."; Column 12: 58-63, "The newly constructed physical path is then used to determine whether a template file exists for the browser, step 110. If no file is found, the original URL is not changed and template selection control is then relinquished to the next service step, step 116. In that case, the default template is used."; Column 14: 7-10, "If no default template exists, the directory is again changed to a directory one level higher in the directory hierarchy (e.g., to the directory computer), step 124."*);
- obtaining profile information associated with a user of the document (*see Column 10: 34-37, "The script 14 then retrieves from the data source 12 data relating to the identified user ..."*);
- generating a document solution tailored to the profile information associated with the user of the document (*see Column 11: 21-25, "... the document delivered to the user contains content arranged in an attractive, effective manner and which is specific to the user's interests or*

Art Unit: 2191

which provides the user with customized information regarding the user's relationship with the web site manager.”); and

- downloading the tailored document solution to the application for provision of functionality provided by the tailored document solution to the document (*see Column 7: 25-33, “A communication connection is established between the web server 10 and client computers 2, either via direct links or via indirect links over the Internet.”; Column 11: 16-18, “If the end of the template is reached, step 80, the template has been completely populated and is delivered to the user ... ”).*

However, Donohue et al. do not disclose:

- wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions.

Baldwin et al. disclose:

- wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions (*see Figure 8; Column 9: 35-46, “Help-information table 140, displayed within secondary window 154, includes a listing of help menu item topics and help-links to other Web pages.”).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Baldwin et al. into the teaching of Donohue et al. to include wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to

Art Unit: 2191

allow a user to consult help information without going back and forth between windows (*see Baldwin et al. – Column 9: 46-48*).

As per **Claim 2**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Donohue et al. further disclose:

- whereby assembling the plurality of software components includes assembling the plurality of software components comprising one or more document solutions in a manifest of document solutions (*see Column 7: 37-41, "... the data source 12 is a relational database and includes a database storing content to be inserted into the templates 24 and a database management system for creating database structures, declaring data relationships, and performing database operations. "*); and
- whereby prior to obtaining profile information associated with a user of the document, calling the manifest to request the tailored document solution, and passing an identification of the user of the document to the manifest with the request for the tailored document (*see Column 7: 49-53, "... a data source 12 storing order and account information for users who purchase items from a merchant operating a web site can include names such as User_Id (storing a unique identifier for each user who registers with the web site) ..." and 64-67 through Column 8: 1-2, "Using the sample names given above, the data source interface function 20 retrieves from the data source 12 the value of the User_Id based on the identity of the user or client 2, retrieves the names and corresponding values for any other names which are linked to the User_Id name in the data source 12 ... "*).

As per **Claim 3**, the rejection of **Claim 2** is incorporated; and Donohue et al. further disclose:

- whereby in response to the identification of the user of the document, calling a user information database from the manifest to obtain profile information associated with the user of the document (*see Column 7: 64-67 through Column 8: 1-2, "Using the sample names given above, the data source interface function 20 retrieves from the data source 12 the value of the User_Id based on the identity of the user or client 2, retrieves the names and corresponding values for any other names which are linked to the User_Id name in the data source 12 ..."*); and
- whereby generating a document solution tailored to the profile information associated with the user of the document includes selecting one or more document solution components from a plurality of document solution components based on the profile information (*see Column 9: 26-29, "... the dynamic tag 34 @User_Id@ is replaced with the value of the name User_Id stored in the container."*).

As per **Claim 4**, the rejection of **Claim 3** is incorporated; and Donohue et al. further disclose:

- if the plurality of software components is not present in the local library of software components, calling the manifest for obtaining the document solution (*see Column 7: 49-53, "... a data source 12 storing order and account information for users who purchase items from a merchant operating a web site can include names such as User_Id (storing a unique identifier for each user who registers with the web site) ..."*).

As per **Claim 5**, the rejection of **Claim 4** is incorporated; however, Donohue et al. and Baldwin et al. do not disclose:

- whereby the manifest is an Active Server Page operative to call the user information database to obtain the profile information for the user of the document and to generate the tailored document solution by selecting one or more document solution components from a plurality of document solution components based on the profile information.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known within the computing art to implement the manifest as an Active Server Page operative. Active Server Page (ASP) is a very well known Web programming scripting language that provides simplicity, speed, and security. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include whereby the manifest is an Active Server Page operative to call the user information database to obtain the profile information for the user of the document and to generate the tailored document solution by selecting one or more document solution components from a plurality of document solution components based on the profile information. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide simplicity, speed, and security.

As per **Claim 6**, Donohue et al. disclose:

- obtaining the computer-generated document (*see Figure 3A: 48*);
- determining whether the computer-generated document references a document solution (*see Figure 3A: 54; Column 10: 34-42, "The script 14 also selects a template based at least in part on the document requested in the URL ..."*);

- if the computer-generated document references a document solution, determining whether the referenced document solution is present in a local library of software components *(see Column 10: 17-19, "The templates may be assigned filenames with extensions .tem, and are saved and stored in various directories on the web server ..."; Column 12: 58-60, "The newly constructed physical path is then used to determine whether a template file exists for the browser ...")*;
- if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, calling a manifest of document solutions for the document solution *(see Column 7: 49-53, "... a data source 12 storing order and account information for users who purchase items from a merchant operating a web site can include names such as User_Id (storing a unique identifier for each user who registers with the web site) ..." and 64-67 through Column 8: 1-2, "Using the sample names given above, the data source interface function 20 retrieves from the data source 12 the value of the User_Id based on the identity of the user or client 2, retrieves the names and corresponding values for any other names which are linked to the User_Id name in the data source 12 ...")*;
- passing an identification of a user of the computer-generated document to the manifest of document solutions *(see Column 7: 49-53, "... a data source 12 storing order and account information for users who purchase items from a merchant operating a web site can include names such as User_Id (storing a unique identifier for each user who registers with the web site) ..." and 64-67 through Column 8: 1-2, "Using the sample names given above, the data source interface function 20 retrieves from the data source 12 the value of the User_Id based on*

Art Unit: 2191

the identity of the user or client 2, retrieves the names and corresponding values for any other names which are linked to the User_Id name in the data source 12 ...");

- at the manifest, calling a database of user information with the identification of the user for obtaining profile information for the user of the computer-generated document (*see Column 7: 64-67 through Column 8: 1-2, "Using the sample names given above, the data source interface function 20 retrieves from the data source 12 the value of the User_Id based on the identity of the user or client 2, retrieves the names and corresponding values for any other names which are linked to the User_Id name in the data source 12 ...");*

- obtaining profile information associated with the user of the computer-generated document (*see Column 7: 64-67 through Column 8: 1-2, "Using the sample names given above, the data source interface function 20 retrieves from the data source 12 the value of the User_Id based on the identity of the user or client 2, retrieves the names and corresponding values for any other names which are linked to the User_Id name in the data source 12 ...");*

- at the manifest, generating a document solution tailored to the profile information associated with the user of the computer-generated document (*see Column 11: 21-25, "...the document delivered to the user contains content arranged in an attractive, effective manner and which is specific to the user's interests or which provides the user with customized information regarding the user's relationship with the web site manager. ");* and

- downloading the tailored document solution to the application for provision of functionality provided by the tailored document solution to the computer-generated document (*see Column 7: 25-33, "A communication connection is established between the web server 10 and client computers 2, either via direct links or via indirect links over the Internet. "; Column*

11: 16-18, *"If the end of the template is reached, step 80, the template has been completely populated and is delivered to the user ... "*").

However, Donohue et al. do not disclose:

- wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the computer-generated document and a plurality of document actions.

Baldwin et al. disclose:

- wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the computer-generated document and a plurality of document actions (*see Figure 8; Column 9: 35-46, "Help-information table 140, displayed within secondary window 154, includes a listing of help menu item topics and help-links to other Web pages. "*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Baldwin et al. into the teaching of Donohue et al. to include wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the computer-generated document and a plurality of document actions. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to allow a user to consult help information without going back and forth between windows (*see Baldwin et al. – Column 9: 46-48*).

As per **Claim 9**, Donohue et al. disclose:

- obtaining a document at the software application, wherein a schema is attached to the document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document (*see Figure 3A: 48; Column 8: 25-54, "HTML documents ... contains text 30 and standard HTML tags 32 including character and paragraph formatting tags ..., tags to produce a form to be completed by a user ..., anchors for hyperlinks ..., and image insertion tags ..."*);
- determining whether the document contains a property identifying the document as being part of a document solution (*see Figure 3B: 58 and 60; Column 10: 51-55, "The template parsing function 18 then reads the contents of the template to locate the "@" control symbols, step 58, and identifies the character string surrounded by the control symbols as a dynamic tag, IF instruction or LOOP instruction, step 60."*);
- if the document contains a property identifying the document as being part of a document solution, passing a solution directory for a document solution matching the property identifying the document as being part of a document solution (*see Figure 3B: 62; Column 10: 60-65, "For a dynamic tag, the template parser 18 calls the appropriate library function 22 to retrieve the value corresponding to the name in the tag from the container, step 62, and replace the dynamic tag, including the name and control symbols, with the value retrieved from the container, step 64."*); and
- if the solution directory contains a document solution matching the property identifying the document as being part of a document solution, replacing the document solution contained in the solution directory with the document obtained at the software application (*see Figure 3B: 64; Column 10: 60-65, "For a dynamic tag, the template parser 18 calls the appropriate library function 22 to retrieve the value corresponding to the name in the tag from*

the container, step 62, and replace the dynamic tag, including the name and control symbols, with the value retrieved from the container, step 64.”).

However, Donohue et al. do not disclose:

- wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions.

Baldwin et al. disclose:

- wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions (*see Figure 8; Column 9: 35-46, “Help-information table 140, displayed within secondary window 154, includes a listing of help menu item topics and help-links to other Web pages.”*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Baldwin et al. into the teaching of Donohue et al. to include wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to allow a user to consult help information without going back and forth between windows (*see Baldwin et al. – Column 9: 46-48*).

Claims 12-16 are computer-readable medium claims corresponding to the method claims above (Claims 1-5) and, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of Claims 1-5.

15. **Claims 7 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Donohue et al.** (US 5,987,480) in view of **Baldwin et al.** (US 5,877,757) as applied to Claim 6 above, and further in view of **Forbes et al.** (US 6,381,742).

As per **Claim 7**, the rejection of **Claim 6** is incorporated; and **Donohue et al.** further disclose:

- calling the location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification (*see Column 7: 49-53, "... a data source 12 storing order and account information for users who purchase items from a merchant operating a web site can include names such as User_Id (storing a unique identifier for each user who registers with the web site) ..."*); and
- downloading the document solution identified by the document solution identification to the computer-generated document (*see Column 7: 25-33, "A communication connection is established between the web server 10 and client computers 2, either via direct links or via indirect links over the Internet."; Column 11: 16-18, "If the end of the template is reached, step 80, the template has been completely populated and is delivered to the user ..."*).

However, **Donohue et al.** and **Baldwin et al.** do not disclose:

- whereby if the computer-generated document does not reference a document solution, determining whether the computer-generated document references a namespace associated with structure applied to the computer-generated document;
- if the computer-generated document references a namespace, calling a manifest collection, and determining whether the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace; and

- if the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace, obtaining a location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification.

Forbes et al. disclose:

- whereby if the computer-generated document does not reference a document solution, determining whether the computer-generated document references a namespace associated with structure applied to the computer-generated document (*see Column 14: 20-24, "... the presence of a namespace XML tag in the manifest file causes the package manager to associate the files and components of the corresponding application in the code store data structure with the unique namespace specified in the tag."*);

- if the computer-generated document references a namespace, calling a manifest collection, and determining whether the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace (*see Column 14: 20-24, "... the presence of a namespace XML tag in the manifest file causes the package manager to associate the files and components of the corresponding application in the code store data structure with the unique namespace specified in the tag."*); and

- if the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace, obtaining a location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification (*see Column 14: 24-29, "When an application is executed, the package manager passes the associated namespace name to the computer's runtime environment so that any files and components installed in that namespace are visible to the application while files and components installed in other namespaces are not."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Forbes et al. into the teaching of Donohue et al. to include whereby if the computer-generated document does not reference a document solution, determining whether the computer-generated document references a namespace associated with structure applied to the computer-generated document; if the computer-generated document references a namespace, calling a manifest collection, and determining whether the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace; and if the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace, obtaining a location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to assure that applications will function correctly even though identically named and having common components or files and that the applications will continue to function correctly irregardless of the number of applications using the same components or files, which may be installed on the computer (*see Forbes et al. – Column 14: 42-48*).

As per **Claim 8**, the rejection of **Claim 7** is incorporated; however, Donohue et al., Baldwin et al., and Forbes et al. do not disclose:

- populating the manifest collection with one or more namespace/solution pairs whereby each namespace/solution pair matches a document solution to a particular document namespace.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known within the computing art to store data using relationship pairs. Data defining a relationship between two entities are commonly stored as data pairs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include populating the manifest collection with one or more namespace/solution pairs whereby each namespace/solution pair matches a document solution to a particular document namespace. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a quick and efficient lookup of one-to-one relationship data.

16. **Claims 10, 11, 17, and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Donohue et al.** (US 5,987,480) in view of **Baldwin et al.** (US 5,877,757) and **Forbes et al.** (US 6,381,742).

As per **Claim 10**, **Donohue et al.** disclose:

- obtaining the computer-generated document at the software application, wherein a schema is attached to the computer-generated document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the computer-generated document (*see Figure 3A: 48; Column 8: 25-54, "HTML documents ... contains text 30 and standard HTML tags 32 including character and paragraph formatting tags ..., tags to produce a form to be completed by a user ..., anchors for hyperlinks ..., and image insertion tags ..."*);
- calling the location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification (*see Column 7: 25-33, "A communication connection is established between the*

web server 10 and client computers 2, either via direct links or via indirect links over the Internet.”; Column 11: 16-18, “If the end of the template is reached, step 80, the template has been completely populated and is delivered to the user ... ”); and

- downloading the document solution identified by the document solution identification to the computer-generated document (*see Column 7: 25-33, “A communication connection is established between the web server 10 and client computers 2, either via direct links or via indirect links over the Internet.”; Column 11: 16-18, “If the end of the template is reached, step 80, the template has been completely populated and is delivered to the user ... ”).*

However, Donohue et al. do not disclose:

- determining whether the computer-generated document references a document namespace;
- if the computer-generated document references a document namespace, determining whether a manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace; and
- if the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace, obtaining a location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification, wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the computer-generated document and a plurality of document actions.

Forbes et al. disclose:

- determining whether the computer-generated document references a document namespace (*see Column 14: 20-24, “... the presence of a namespace XML tag in the manifest file*

causes the package manager to associate the files and components of the corresponding application in the code store data structure with the unique namespace specified in the tag.”);

- if the computer-generated document references a document namespace, determining whether a manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace (*see Column 14: 20-24, “... the presence of a namespace XML tag in the manifest file causes the package manager to associate the files and components of the corresponding application in the code store data structure with the unique namespace specified in the tag.”*); and

- if the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace, obtaining a location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification (*see Column 14: 24-29, “When an application is executed, the package manager passes the associated namespace name to the computer's runtime environment so that any files and components installed in that namespace are visible to the application while files and components installed in other namespaces are not.”*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Forbes et al. into the teaching of Donohue et al. to include determining whether the computer-generated document references a document namespace; if the computer-generated document references a document namespace, determining whether a manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace; and if the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace, obtaining a location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification. The modification would be obvious because

Art Unit: 2191

one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to assure that applications will function correctly even though identically named and having common components or files and that the applications will continue to function correctly irregardless of the number of applications using the same components or files, which may be installed on the computer (*see Forbes et al.* – *Column 14: 42-48*).

Baldwin et al. disclose:

- wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the computer-generated document and a plurality of document actions (*see Figure 8; Column 9: 35-46, "Help-information table 140, displayed within secondary window 154, includes a listing of help menu item topics and help-links to other Web pages."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Baldwin et al. into the teaching of Donohue et al. to include wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the computer-generated document and a plurality of document actions. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to allow a user to consult help information without going back and forth between windows (*see Baldwin et al.* – *Column 9: 46-48*).

As per **Claim 11**, the rejection of **Claim 10** is incorporated; and Donohue et al. further disclose:

- passing an identification of a user of the computer-generated document to a manifest of document solutions identified by the document solution identification as the location of the document solution (*see Column 7: 37-41, "... the data source 12 is a relational database and includes a database storing content to be inserted into the templates 24 and a database management system for creating database structures, declaring data relationships, and performing database operations."*);
- at the manifest, calling a database of user information with the identification of the user for obtaining profile information for the user of the computer-generated document (*see Column 7: 64-67 through Column 8: 1-2, "Using the sample names given above, the data source interface function 20 retrieves from the data source 12 the value of the User_Id based on the identity of the user or client 2, retrieves the names and corresponding values for any other names which are linked to the User_Id name in the data source 12 ..."*);
- obtaining profile information associated for the user of the computer-generated document (*see Column 7: 64-67 through Column 8: 1-2, "Using the sample names given above, the data source interface function 20 retrieves from the data source 12 the value of the User_Id based on the identity of the user or client 2, retrieves the names and corresponding values for any other names which are linked to the User_Id name in the data source 12 ..."*);
- at the manifest, generating a document solution tailored to the profile information associated with the user of the computer-generated document (*see Column 11: 21-25, "... the document delivered to the user contains content arranged in an attractive, effective manner and which is specific to the user's interests or which provides the user with customized information regarding the user's relationship with the web site manager."*); and

- whereby downloading the document solution identified by the document solution identification to the computer-generated document includes downloading the tailored document solution to the computer-generated document for providing the functionality of the tailored document solution to the computer-generated document (*see Column 7: 25-33, "A communication connection is established between the web server 10 and client computers 2, either via direct links or via indirect links over the Internet."; Column 11: 16-18, "If the end of the template is reached, step 80, the template has been completely populated and is delivered to the user ... "*).

Claims 17 and 18 are computer-readable medium claims corresponding to the method claims above (Claims 10 and 11) and, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of Claims 10 and 11.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 17 have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In the remarks, Applicant argues that:

a) Donohue does not disclose or suggest, however, attaching a schema to the document that defines permissible data content, data type, and data structure for the document. Col. 8, lines 25-54 of Donohue, referenced by the Office Action simply describe an HTML document template.

Examiner's response:

a) Examiner disagrees. Donohue et al. clearly disclose attaching a schema to the document that defines permissible data content, data type, and data structure for the document (*see Column 8: 25-54, "HTML documents ... contains text 30 and standard HTML tags 32 including character and paragraph formatting tags ..., tags to produce a form to be completed by a user ..., anchors for hyperlinks ..., and image insertion tags ..."*). Note that the HTML documents are composed using the allowable tags (<head>, <body>, <form>, etc.) predefined by the HTML schema.

In the remarks, Applicant argues that:

b) Moreover, Donohue fails to describe, determining whether the document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components and assembling the software components of documents solutions at a remote location if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components. Fig. 5, element 110 and col. 12, lines 58-60 of Donohue describe using a newly constructed physical path to determine whether a template file exists for the browser. This is completely different from the Applicants' recited method of determining whether the document solution is present in a local library of software components and assembling the software components of documents solutions at a remote location if the software components are not present in the local library.

Examiner's response:

b) Examiner disagrees. Donohue et al. clearly disclose determining whether the document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components and assembling the software components of documents solutions at a remote location if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components (*see Column 10: 49-51, "The contents of the selected template are then retrieved, step 56, either all at once or by loading sections of the template sequentially into a buffer."; Column 12: 58-63, "The newly constructed physical path is then used to determine whether a template file exists for the browser, step 110. If no file is found, the original URL is not changed and template selection control is then relinquished to the next service step, step 116. In that case, the default template is used."; Column 14: 7-10, "If no default template exists, the directory is again changed to a directory one level higher in the directory hierarchy (e.g., to the directory computer), step 124."*). Note that a document's physical path (local library of software components) is used to search for a template (document solution). If the template is not found in the physical path's immediate directory, then a default template from the immediate directory's parent directory (remote location) is used.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Qing Chen whose telephone number is 571-270-1071. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen, can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2191

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QC / AC
June 6, 2007



WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER